植 物 分 类 与 资 源 学 报　2011, **33** (5): 509~517
Plant Diversity and Resources　DOI: 10.3724/SP.J.1143.2011.11134

Changes to publication requirements made at the XVIII International Botanical Congress in Melbourne— What does e-publication mean for you?

Sandra Knapp[1 *], John McNeill[2], Nicholas J. Turland[3]

(1 *Department of Botany, The Natural History Museum*, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, UK;
2 *Royal Botanic Garden, Edinburgh*, 20A Inverleith Row, Edinburgh EH3 5LR, UK;
3 *Missouri Botanical Garden*, PO Box 299, St Louis, MO 63166-0299, USA)

Abstract: Changes to the *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature* are decided on every 6 years at Nomenclature Sections associated with International Botanical Congresses (IBC). The XVIII IBC was held in Melbourne, Australia; the Nomenclature Section met on 18-22 July 2011 and its decisions were accepted by the Congress at its plenary session on 30 July. Several important changes were made to the *Code* as a result of this meeting that will affect publication of new names. Two of these changes will come into effect on 1 January 2012, some months before the *Melbourne Code* is published. Electronic material published online in Portable Document Format (PDF) with an International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) or an International Standard Book Number (ISBN) will constitute effective publication, and the requirement for a Latin description or diagnosis for names of new taxa will be changed to a requirement for a description or diagnosis in either Latin or English. In addition, effective from 1 January 2013, new names of organisms treated as fungi must, in order to be validly published, include in the protologue (everything associated with a name at its valid publication) the citation of an identifier issued by a recognized repository (such as MycoBank). Draft text of the new articles dealing with electronic publication is provided and best practice is outlined.

To encourage dissemination of the changes made to the International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants, this article will be published in *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society*, *Brittonia*, *Cladistics*, *MycoKeys*, *Mycotaxon*, *New Phytologist*, *North American Fungi*, *Novon*, *Opuscula Philolichenum*, *PhytoKeys*, *Phytoneuron*, *Phytotaxa*, *Plant Diversity and Resources*, *Systematic Botany* and *Taxon*.

Key words: International Code of Botanical Nomenclature; Electronic Publication; International Standard Serial Number (ISSN); International Standard Book Number (ISBN); Portable Document Format (PDF); Life Science Identifier (LSID); MycoBank

CLC number: Q 31　**Document Code**: A　**Article ID**: 0253-2700(2011)05-509-09

Introduction

At the XVIII International Botanical Congress in Melbourne, Australia, in July 2011, two important changes were made to the *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature* (now the *International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants*) that will take effect from 1 January 2012. These changes will affect everyone who publishes names governed by this *Code*. As the *Melbourne Code* will not be published until approximately mid-2012, we felt it would be helpful to outline these changes, particularly those concerning effective publication in electronic media (in Articles 29, 30, and 31). For a concise report on all the changes to the *Code* accept-

* Corresponding author: Sandra Knapp (s.knapp@nhm.ac.uk)

Received date: 2011-08-24, Accepted date: 2011-08-25

ed in Melbourne, see McNeill *et al*. (2011).

A draft wording of the revised Articles, Notes, and Recommendations on effective publication is provided to aid editors and publishers in establishing best practice for implementing this aspect of the *Code*. We also outline here what these changes do *not* mean, to guide those wishing to publish new names and typifications by electronic means. We urge readers to consult the report of the Special Committee on Electronic Publication accompanying the changes proposed before the Congress (Chapman *et al*. 2010), wherein the reasoning for the changes now accepted into the *Code* is set out.

Draft wording of revised Articles 29, 30, and 31 and recommendations 29A, 30A, and 31A

Here we reproduce the wording of all of the relevant Articles, Notes, and Recommendations (omitting the Examples), with the changes highlighted in **bold**. The wording here is provisional, pending the meeting of the Editorial Committee in December 2011 to finalize the printed version of the *Melbourne Code*.

Article 29

29.1. Publication is effected, under this *Code*, by distribution of printed matter (through sale, exchange or gift) to the general public or at least to botanical institutions with libraries accessible to botanists generally. **Publication is also effected by electronic distribution of material in Portable Document Format (PDF; see also Art. 29.3 and Rec. 29A.1) in an online publication with an International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) or an International Standard Book Number (ISBN).** Publication is not effected by communication of new names at a public meeting, by the placing of names in collections or gardens open to the public, by the issue of microfilm made from manuscripts, typescripts or other unpublished material, or by distribution electronically **other than as described above**.

***29.2*. For the purpose of this Article, "online" is defined as accessible electronically via the World Wide Web.**

***29.3*. Should Portable Document Format (PDF) be succeeded, a successor international standard format communicated by the General Committee (see Div. III) is acceptable.**

***29.4*. The content of a particular electronic publication must not be altered after it is first issued. Any such alterations are not themselves effectively published. Corrections or revisions must be issued separately to be effectively published.**

Recommendation 29A

[Existing Recommendation replaced by the following:]

***29A.1*. Publication electronically in Portable Document Format (PDF) should comply with the PDF/A archival standard (ISO 19005).**

***29A.2*. Authors should preferably publish in publications that are archived, satisfying the following criteria as far as is practical (see also Rec. 29A.1):**

(*a*) The material should be placed in multiple trusted online digital repositories, e.g. an ISO-certified repository;

(*b*) Digital repositories should be in more than one area of the world and preferably on different continents;

(*c*) Deposition of printed copies in libraries in more than one area of the world and preferably on different continents is also advisable.

Article 30

***30.1*. Publication by distribution of electronic material does not consti-tute effective publication before 1 January 2012.**

***30.2*. An electronic publication is not effectively published if there is evidence associated with or within the publication that it is merely a preliminary version that was, or is to be, re-**

placed by a version that the publisher considers final, in which case only that final version is effectively published.

30.3. Publication by indelible autograph before 1 January 1953 is effective. Indelible autograph produced at a later date is not effectively published.

30.4. For the purpose of this Article, indelible autograph is handwritten material reproduced by some mechanical or graphic process (such as lithography, offset, or metallic etching).

30.5. Publication on or after 1 January 1953 in trade catalogues or non-scientific newspapers, and on or after 1 January 1973 in seed-exchange lists, does not constitute effective publication.

30.6. The distribution on or after 1 January 1953 of printed matter accompanying exsiccatae does not constitute effective publication.

Note 1. If the printed matter is also distributed independently of the exsiccata, it is effectively published.

30.7. Publication on or after 1 January 1953 of an independent non-serial work stated to be a thesis submitted to a university or other institute of education for the purpose of obtaining a degree is not effectively published unless it includes an explicit statement (referring to the requirements of the *Code* for effective publication) or other internal evidence that it is regarded as an effective publication by its author or publisher.

Note 2. The presence of an International Standard Book Number (ISBN) or a statement of the name of the printer, publisher, or distributor in the original printed version is regarded as internal evidence that the work was intended to be effectively published.

Recommendation 30A

***30A.1.* Preliminary and final versions of the same electronic publication should be clearly indicated as such when they are first issued.**

30A.2. It is strongly recommended that authors avoid publishing new names and descriptions or diagnoses of new taxa (nomenclatural novelties) in ephemeral printed matter of any kind, in particular printed matter that is multiplied in restricted and uncertain numbers, in which the permanence of the text may be lim-ited, for which effective publication in terms of number of copies is not obvious, or that is unlikely to reach the general public. Authors should also avoid publishing new names and descriptions or diagnoses in popular periodicals, in abstracting journals, or on correction slips.

30A.3. To aid availability through time and place, authors publishing nomenclatural novelties should give preference to periodicals that regularly publish taxonomic articles. **Otherwise, a copy of a publication (whether published as printed or electronic matter) should be sent to an indexing centre appropriate to the taxonomic group, and publications that exist only as printed matter** should be deposited in at least ten, but preferably more, botanical or other gener ally accessible libraries throughout the world.

30A.4. Authors and editors are encouraged to mention nomenclatural novelties in the summary or abstract, or list them in an index in the publication.

Article 31

31.1. The date of effective publication is the date on which the printed **or electronic** matter became available as defined in Art. 29 and 30. In the absence of proof establishing some other date, the one appearing in the printed **or electronic** matter must be accepted as correct.

[Existing Note 1 replaced by the following:]

***31.2.* When a publication is issued in parallel electronic and printed ver-sions, these must be treated as effectively published on the same date unless the dates of the versions are different according to Art. 31.1.**

31.3. When separates from periodicals or other works placed on sale are issued in advance, the date on the separate is accepted as the date of effective publication unless there is evidence that it is erroneous.

Recommendation 31A

31A. 1. The date on which the publisher or publisher's agent delivers printed matter to one of the usual carriers for distribution to the public should be accepted as its date of effective publication.

Best practice

Authors of new names, editors and publishers will all be interested in ensuring that the publications including new names are in accordance with the *Melbourne Code*, so that the names therein are effectively published. We suggest that those publishing in journals or monograph series and books that have online editions communicate with the editors so that best practice can be established across the community as quickly as possible. Many publishers have been carefully addressing the issues involved with the e-publication of novelties for some time (see Knapp and Wright 2010; guidelines in PLoS One [http://www. plosone. org/static/policies. action#taxon]) and considerable interest in making these new *Code* changes function effectively has been apparent.

Some practices that we feel will help with the initial stages of e-publication of nov-elties that are according to the *Melbourne Code* are:

- Havingeach article bearthe dateof publication prominently (as is done in many journals, for example *New Phytologist* or *Nature*).
- If an online arly ersion isissued that is not the same as thefinal version (and thus not the place of effective publication), stamp each article with this fact prominently (for example *American Journal of Botany*).
- Prominent display of the ISSN or ISBNof the publication on each articlewillhelp indexers establish effective publication.
- Publication in journals (ormonograph series) that participatein the CLOCKSS system (see Knapp and Wright 2010 for a description) or another international archive and preservation system will ensure long-term archiving.
- Authors of newnamesby electronic means should alertthe appropriate indexing center as recommended in Rec. 30A. 3—this will help indexers who may otherwise not be aware of electronically published names.

What these changes do *not* mean

Although the new Articles and Recommendations use the terms PDF and PDF/A, this does not mean that publications must be issued *only* in that format to be effectively published. For example, some online journals issue papers in Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) format together with a parallel PDF version. In such cases, the PDF version will be effectively published. The stipulation that the General Committee for Botanical Nomenclature will communicate the acceptability of a new international standard format, should PDF ever be succeeded, means authors of novelties and the community using the *Code* can remain informed as to advances in the field and that the *Code* will be protected from obsolescence.

Use of the following means of electronic publication will *not* result in effective publication of novelties under the *Melbourne Code*:

- Publication on websites or in ephemeral documents available overthe Internet (there are strict criteria for granting of ISSNs [http://www. issn. org]).
- Publication in journals without aregistered ISSN-or e-ISSN.
- Publication in books without a registeredISBNor e-ISBN.

The Recommendation approved to advise the deposition of a hard copy of any e-publication in a library suggests to botanists an action, but it does not set out standard practice or a protocol for librarians to follow. Librarians are themselves in a complex transition zone between publication modalities (Johnson and Luther 2007), and botanists may find librarians to be unwilling or unable to accommodate single hard copy papers as individual accessions

should the volume be great.

Two other important changes to the *Code* relating to the publication of names

The second change to the *Code* approved in Melbourne to take effect from 1 January 2012 is that the description or diagnosis required for valid publication of the name of a new taxon of all organisms falling under the *Code* may be in either English or Latin. This is the current provision for names of plant fossils, but all new non-fossil taxa have required a Latin description or diagnosis (fungi and plants from 1 January 1935; algae [including cyanobacteria, if treated under the *Code*] from 1 January 1958). This has no bearing on the form of scientific names, which continue to be Latin or treated as Latin. Individual journal requirements for Latin and/or English will, of course, be determined by the editors of those journals.

A third change to the *Code* approved in Melbourne relating to publication of names, but one not taking effect until 1 January 2013 (not 1 January 2012 as reported by Miller *et al*. 2011), is that all new names of organisms treated as fungi must, as an additional requirement for valid publication, include in the protologue (everything associated with a name at its valid publication) the citation of an identifier issued by a recognized repository (such as MycoBank [http://www.mycobank.org/]). This will be publicized separately.

The requirement for a unique identifier for new names of fungi on or after 1 January 2013 does *not* apply to plants or algae; there is no need for authors of new names in these groups to request Life Science Identifiers (LSIDs)—or other identifiers—from indexing centers.

Acknowledgements: SK is supported by the NSF's Planetary Biodiversity Inventory program (DEB-0316614, 'PBI Solanum-a worldwide treatment'). JMcN's and NJT's attendance at the Nomenclature Section of the XVIII IBC in Melbourne was supported in part by the International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT). We thank Katherine Challis (Kew) for helpful comments.

To encourage dissemination of the changes made to the International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants, this article will be published in *BMC Evolu-tionary Biology*, *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society*, *Brittonia*, *Cladistics*, *MycoKeys*, *Mycotaxon*, *New Phytologist*, *North American Fungi*, *Novon*, *Opuscula Philolichenum*, *PhytoKeys*, *Phytoneuron*, *Phytotaxa*, *Plant Diversity and Resources*, *Systematic Botany* and *Taxon*.

References:

Chapman AD, Turland NJ, Watson MF, Eds, 2010. Report of the Special Committee on Electronic Publication [J]. *Taxon*, **59**: 1853—1862

Johnson RK, Luther J , 2007. The E-Only Tipping Point for Journals: What's Ahead in the Print-to-Electronic Transition Zone. Washington: Association of Research Librarians

DC Knapp S, Wright D , 2010. E-publish or perish? [A]. In: Polaszek A ed, *Systema Naturae 250—the Linnaean Ark* [M]. London: Taylor and Francis, 83—93

McNeill J, Turland NJ, Monro A *et al*., 2011. XVIII International Botanical Congress: preliminary mail vote and report of Congress action on nomenclature proposals [J]. *Taxon*, **60**: 1—14

Miller JS, Funk VA, Wagner WL *et al*., 2011. Outcomes of the 2011 Botanical Nomenclature Section at the XVIII International Botanical Congress [J]. *PhytoKeys*, **5**: 1—3

在墨尔本召开的第18届国际植物学大会做出的有关名称发表要求的变化——电子出版物对你意味着什么?

张丽兵 译*

摘要:《国际植物命名法规》的修订由每六年一次的国际植物学大会(IBC)命名分会来决定。第18届国际植物学大会在澳大利亚墨尔本举行;命名分会于2011年7月18日至22日召开,其决议获得7月30日的全体会议通过。"墨尔本法规"有几个重要的变化,将影响新名称的发表。这些变化中的两个将在"墨尔本法规"出版前的几个月,即于2012年1月1日起生效。通过以移动文档格式(Portable Document Format;pdf)在线发表的具有国际标准连续出版物号(ISSN)或国际标准图书编号(ISBN)的电子出版物,将构成有效发表。新分类群名称的合格发表所必须的拉丁文描述或特征集要将更改为拉丁文或英文描述或特征集要。此外,自2013年1月1日起,被处理为真菌的生物的新名称必须在原始资料(某一名称合格发表时与之有关的所有资料)中引证一个由一家公认的存储库(例如MycoBank)签发的标识码,才构成合格发表。本文提供了有关电子出版物的新规则的草案文本,并概述了相应的最佳做法。

关键词:国际植物命名法规;电子出版;国际标准连续出版物号;国际标准图书编号;移动文档格式;生命科学标识码;真菌库

Translation into Chinese of:"Changes to Publication Requirements Made at the XVIII International Botanical Congress in Melbourne—What does e-Publication Mean for You?"

Sandra Knapp[1**], John McNeill[2], Nicholas J. Turland[3]

(Translation into Chinese by Li-Bing Zhang*)

(1 *Department of Botany*, *The Natural History Museum*, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U. K.;

2 *Royal Botanic Garden*, Edinburgh, 20A Inverleith Row, Edinburgh EH3 5LR, U. K.;

3 *Missouri Botanical Garden*, P. O. Box 299, St. Louis MO 63166-0299, U. S. A.)

为便于《国际藻类、真菌和植物命名法规》中的变化得到广泛的了解,本文将发表在*BMC Evolutionary Biology*, *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society*, *Brittonia*, *Cladistics*, *MycoKeys*, *Mycotaxon*, *New Phytologist*, *North American Fungi*, *Novon*, *Opuscula Philolichenum*, *PhytoKeys*, *Phytoneuron*, *Phytotaxa*,《植物分类与资源学报》, *Systematic Botany* 和 *Taxon*。

序言

于2011年7月在澳大利亚墨尔本召开的第18届国际植物学大会通过的《国际植物命名法规》(现称为《国际藻类、真菌和植物命名法规》)有两个重要的变化,并将于2012年1月1日生效。这些变化将影响到每一个发表相关名称的人。由于"墨尔本法规"大约要等到2012年中才能出版,我们认为将这些变化,特别是那些

* Correspondence: Libing. Zhang@ mobot. org, Missouri Botanical Garden, P. O. Box 299, St. Louis MO 63166-0299, U. S. A.

** Correspondence: Sandra Knapp, s. knapp@ nhm. ac. uk

收稿日期:2011-08-24, 2011-08-25 接受发表

作者简介:张丽兵(1966-)男,博士,主要从事蕨类植物和种子植物的分类、进化、生物地理和命名法规的研究。

E-mail: Libing. zhang@ mobot. org

有关在电子媒体中有效发表的变化（规则 29，30，31），做一概述，将对我们的读者有所裨益。有关在墨尔本接受的所有变化的一个简明报告，可参阅 McNeill 等（2011）。

本文提供了修订后的有关有效发表的规则、注释和辅则的草案，以帮助编辑和出版商建立为实施本法规的最佳做法。我们这里还概述了这些变化并不包含的意思，以指导那些希望通过电子方式发表新名称和指定模式的人们。我们促请读者阅读电子发表特别委员会的报告（Chapman & al.，2010）以及国际植物学大会之前的相关提案。有关法规修订的理由在那里有详细的陈述。

修订后的规则 29，30 和 31，和辅则 29A，30A 及 31A 的草案

在这里，我们复制了所有相关的规则、注释和辅则（省去例子），黑体字指法规中新的变化。这里的措辞只是临时性的，印刷版的“墨尔本法规”的内容将由 2011 年 12 月召开的法规编辑委员会会议来决定。

规则 29

29.1　根据本法规，只有将印刷品向一般公众发行（通过出售、交换或赠送），或至少分送给具有普通植物学家可使用的图书馆的植物学研究机构，这样的发表才是有效发表（effective publication）。**通过以移动文档格式（Portable Document Format）（pdf；也见规则 29.3 及辅则 29A.1）在线发表的具有国际标准连续出版物号（International Standard Serial Number；ISSN）或国际标准图书编号（International Standard Book Number；ISBN）的电子发行，也是有效发表**。在公共会议上对新名称的交流，或将名称置于对公众开放的标本馆或植物园，或发行由文稿（manuscript）、打字稿（typescripts）或其他未发表的材料（unpublished material）制成的微缩胶片（microfilm），或**通过上述电子发表方式之外**的电子发表，均为无效发表。

29.2　就本规则的实际应用而言，“在线”指的是可通过万维网（World Wide Web）访问的。

29.3　如果今后移动文档格式（pdf）被取代，可以接受由总委员会（见第三部分）通报的下一个国际标准格式。

29.4　一个电子出版物首次发行以后，其内容便不能更改。任何更改都是无效发表。对其更正或修改必须独立地发表才构成有效发表。

辅则 29A

［现有辅则被下面辅则取代］

29A.1　以移动文档格式（pdf）的电子发表应遵照 pdf/A 存档标准（国际标准化组织（ISO）19005）。

29A.2　在切实可行的情况下，作者在发表存档的出版物时，应该最好满足以下条件（也见辅则 29A.1）：

（a）材料应存放在多个值得信赖的在线数字资源库，如国际标准化组织（ISO）认证的存储库；

（b）数字资源库应放置在世界上多个地区，最好在不同的大洲；

（c）印本应存放在世界上多个地区、最好在不同的大洲的图书馆。

规则 30

30.1　2012 年 1 月 1 日前电子材料的分发并不构成有效的发表。

30.2　如果存在跟电子出版物相关的证据或有电子出版物内部的证据显示，该电子出版物仅仅是一个初级的版本或将要被一个出版者所认为的最终版本所取代，该电子出版物便不构成有效发表。在这种情况下，只有最终版本才是有效发表。

30.3　1953 年 1 月 1 日之前的擦不掉的手写体（indelible autograph）出版物是有效发表。其后出现的擦不掉的手写体为无效发表。

30.4　就本规则的具体应用而言，擦不掉的手写体是指通过机械或图像过程（例如平版印刷，胶印，或金属蚀刻）复制的手写材料。

30.5　1953 年 1 月 1 日或之后发行的商业目录（trade catalogue）或非学术性报纸，以及 1973 年 1 月 1 日或之后发行的种子交换目录（seed-exchange list），均不构成有效发表。

30.6　在 1953 年 1 月 1 日或之后随腊叶标本（exsiccatae）而被分发的印刷品不构成有效发表。

注释 1. 如果该印刷品在随腊叶标本之外也有分发，则构成有效发表。

30.7 在 1953 年 1 月 1 日或之后，指明为提交给大学或其它教育机构而为获得某种学位的、独立的、非系列的毕业论文的发表，是无效发表，除非论文中清楚地说明（指本法规中有效发表的必要条件）或其它的内部证据（internal evidence）显示其作者或出版者视它为有效发表。

注释 2. 国际标准图书编号（International Standard Book Number；ISBN）的存在，或在原始印刷版中指出了有关印刷厂、出版者或发行者的名字，均被视为相关著作有意为有效发表的内部证据。

辅则 30A

30A.1 同一电子出版物的初级和最终版本在第一次发行时，应清楚地表明它们的版本。

30A.2 本法规强烈地建议，作者应竭力避免在任何临时性的印刷品（ephemeral printed matter）中、特别是那些印数有限和不定的印刷品中发表新名称和新分类群的描述或特征集要（命名新材料 nomenclatural novelties）。这样的印刷品内容的持久性可能会受到限制，其有效发表的拷贝数亦不明显，或者一般公众不太可能接触到。作者也应避免在通俗刊物（popular periodicals）、文摘杂志（abstracting journals）或勘误表（correction slip）上发表新名称和描述或特征集要。

30A.3 为提高时间和地点方面的可用性，发表命名新材料的作者应尽量选择经常发表分类学文章的期刊。**否则，应将其文章的拷贝（无论是印本发表或电子发表）寄给适当的与分类群相关的索引中心（indexing center）。只有印本发表的文章应**存于世界上至少 10 个或最好更多的植物学或其它一般的公共图书馆。

30A.4 作者和编辑最好在摘要（abstract）或概要（summary）中提及所发表的命名新材料，或将其列在出版物的索引中。

规则 31

31.1 有效发表的日期是，根据规则 29 和 30 的规定，印刷品**或电子件**可被使用的日期。如果没有证据证明不同，印刷品**或电子件**上的日期必须被接受为正确的日期。

[现有的注释 1 被以下规则取代]

31.2 当一个出版物同时发行在印刷版和电子版上，必须视印刷版和电子版的有效发表日期相同，除非根据规则 31.1. 印刷版和电子版的有效发表日期不同。

31.3 当期刊或其它出售品的抽印本被提前发行时，抽印本上的日期为有效发表日期，除非有证据显示该日期是错误的。

辅则 31A

31A.1 出版商或其代理将印刷品交付给平常的投递人向公众发行的日期，应被接受为该印刷品的有效发表日期。

最佳做法

新名称的作者、编辑和出版商都将确保含新名称的出版物符合“墨尔本法规”，以便其中的名称是有效发表。我们建议，含网络版的学术期刊或专著系列和书籍的作者与相关编辑沟通，使最佳做法可以在整个领域尽快建立起来。在有一段时间以来，许多出版商都精心讨论过有关新材料的电子发表问题 [Knapp & Wright，2010；*PLoS One* 指南（http://www.plosone.org/static/policies.action#taxon）]。对法规的这些修改使其有效地发挥作用，已势在必行。

我们认为，有些做法将有助于符合“墨尔本法规”的电子发表新材料的开始阶段：

- 在每篇文章的醒目位置注明出版日期（象许多杂志所为，例如 *New Phytologist* 或 *Nature*）。
- 如果早期网络版不是最终版（因而不是有效发表的地方），应在醒目位置注明这一事实（例如 *American Journal of Botany*）。
- 突出显示每篇文章所在的出版物的 ISSN 或 ISBN，将有助于索引编写者确定有关名称是否为有效发表。
- 发表在参与 CLOCKSS 系统（描述见 Knapp & Wright，2010）或其他国际存档和保存系统的期刊（或专著系列）上的文章，将确保其长期归档。
- 通过电子方式发表新名称的作者，应采纳辅则 30A.3 的建议而提醒适当的索引中心。这将有助于

索引编写者意识到其通过电子方式发表的名称。

这些变化不意味着什么

尽管新的规则和辅则使用 PDF 和 PDF/A 术语，这并不意味着，为了有效发表就只能发行这种格式。例如，一些在线期刊发行超文本标记语言（Hypertext Markup Language；HTML）格式的论文，同时还有一个 PDF 的版本。在这种情况下，PDF 版将是有效发表。如果将来 PDF 格式被取代，植物命名总委员会将通报一个新的国际标准格式的接受情况。这一规定意味着，新材料的作者和使用法规的人们会及时了解到该领域的进展情况，并保护法规不至于过时。

根据“墨尔本法规”，使用下列电子出版方式不构成新材料的有效发表：

- 网页上的发表或在因特网上出现的短暂文件（发放 ISSN 号有严格的标准，见 http://www.issn.org/）。
- 没有 ISSN 号或 e-ISSN 号的期刊上的发表。
- 没有 ISSN 号或 e-ISSN 号的书籍中的发表。

获得植物学大会通过的辅则虽建议植物学家们将任何电子出版物的电脑打印件保存在图书馆里，但该辅则并没设定标准做法或需图书馆馆员遵从的规程。图书馆馆员本身处在出版模式之间的复杂的过渡区（Johnson & Luther, 2007）。植物学家可能会发现，如果要保存的量很大，图书馆馆员不愿或无法收存个人单篇论文的电脑打印件。

法规中另外两个重要的有关名称发表的变化

在墨尔本获得通过的从 2012 年 1 月 1 日起生效的法规的第二个变化是，法规所管理的所有生物的新分类群名称的合格发表所需的描述或特征集要可以是英文或拉丁文。这是目前对发表植物化石名称的规定，但所有非化石分类群的新名称的发表，目前都需要拉丁文描述或特征集要（真菌和植物从 1935 年 1 月 1 日开始，藻类［包括根据该法规处理的蓝藻］从 1958 年 1 月 1 日开始）。这一变化跟学名的形式没有关系。学名将继续为拉丁词或被处理为拉丁词。当然，至于期刊要求描述或特征集要为英文和/或拉丁文，则由这些期刊的编辑决定。

直到 2013 年 1 月 1 日才生效（不是如 Miller *et al.*, 2011 所报道的 2012 年 1 月 1 日）的第三个在墨尔本获得通过的有关名称发表的法规的变化是，作为合格发表的附加要求，被处理为真菌的生物的所有新名称必须在原始资料（某一名称合格发表时与之有关的所有资料）中引证一个由一家公认的存储库（例如 MycoBank，http://www.mycobank.org/）签发的标识码。这将另行公布。

2013 年 1 月 1 日或之后的真菌新名称的独特标识码的规定并不适用于植物或藻类；这些类群的新名称的作者不需要从索引中心申请生命科学标识码（Life Science Identifiers；LSIDs）或其他标识码。

致谢　SK 的研究由美国国家科学基金会的 Planetary Biodiversity Inventory 项目（DEB-0316614，“PBI 的世界性的茄属的分类处理”）资助。JMcN 和 NJT 出席在墨尔本召开的第 18 届国际植物学大会命名分会由国际植物分类协会（IAPT）部分赞助。我们感谢 Katherine Challis（Kew）的有益建议。

中文译者致谢　译者对杨祝良和李德铢二博士的有益建议深表感谢！

［参　考　文　献］

Chapman AD, Turland NJ, Watson MF eds, 2010. Report of the Special Committee on Electronic Publication［J］. *Taxon*, **59**: 1853—1862

Johnson RK, Luther J, 2007. *The E-Only Tipping Point for Journals: What's Ahead in the Print-to-Electronic Transition Zone*［M］. Washington DC: Association of Research Librarians

Knapp S, Wright D, 2010. E-publish or perish?［A］. In: Polaszek A ed. *Systema Naturae* 250-*the Linnaean Ark*［M］. London: Taylor and Francis, 83—93

McNeill J, Turland NJ, Monro A *et al.*, 2011. XVIII International Botanical Congress: preliminary mail vote and report of Congress action on nomenclature proposals［J］. *Taxon*, **60**: in press

Miller JS, Funk VA, Wagner WL *et al.*, 2011. Outcomes of the 2011 Botanical Nomenclature Section at the XVIII International Botanical Congress［J］. *PhytoKeys*, **5**: 1—3

PLoS One Editorial and Publishing Policies: Policies Regarding Submission of a New Taxon Name［OL］.［http://www.plosone.org/static/policies.action#taxon］